

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 4-18 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

As an initial matter, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's response to arguments. In view of the response to arguments, Applicants present the following arguments for further consideration:

Claims 1 and 4-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lau (Programming by Demonstration: a Machine Learning Approach (2001)). The Examiner stated essentially that Lau teaches all the limitations of Claims 1 and 4-18.

Claims 1 and 18 claim, *inter alia*, "recording at least one trace of at least one instance of a procedure, wherein the at least one trace comprises a plurality of steps; performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps, wherein the alignment identifies and aligns steps that are equivalent once generalized."

Lau teaches a method including translation, learning and recognition phases (see pages 33-34). At a basic level, Lau is unrelated to the claimed invention; Lau's SMARTedit tool takes training examples including an initial demonstration and one or more examples of feedback (see pages 41-42), such that "as the user provides more examples, SMARTedit's confidence in its predictions increases, because its version space has been updated to contain fewer inaccurate programs." From this passage, it can be determined that Lau teaches a method for training the SMARTedit tool to predict a next step (further, see page 39, last sentence). Comparing Lau's prediction to the claimed "alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps" as claimed in

Claim 1, Lau falls short of anticipating a processing of “steps” against one another; the claimed invention compares steps within the same procedure against one another. Lau fails to teach an analogous processing of the user commands recorded during the initial demonstration.

Further, considering the case of a processing of the initial demonstration and an example of user feedback; Lau is concerned only with a predicted next step; that is a step that is not already part of the initial demonstration or learned procedure. In this regard, Lau makes it clear that there is no possible alignment and generalization of steps already in the procedure (refer back to the claimed limitations wherein a trace is comprised of the steps that are aligned and generalized), essentially as claimed in Claims 1 and 18.

In view of the foregoing, Lau fails to teach all the limitations of Claims 1 and 18, and more particularly, “performing an alignment and generalization of the plurality of steps.”

Claims 4-12, 15-17 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including Claims 1 and 4-18, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 22, 2008

By: /Nathaniel T. Wallace/  
Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicants

**F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC**  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889